

३०२३०३६७५० ५५५०

Industrial International Inter

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 5

David A Belasco Beehler & Pavitt Suite 330 100 Corporate Pointe Culver City CA 90230

MAILED

SEP 06-2012

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Patent No. 6,358,072

Issue Date: 03/19/2002

Application Number: 09/652,982

Filing Date: 08/31/2000

For: AIRCRAFT IGNITION CABLE

CONNECTOR ·

DECISION ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under $37 \text{ CFR } 1.378 \text{ (b)}, ^1 \text{ filed}$ on August 13, 2012, to accept the delayed payment of the maintenance fee for the above-identified patent.

The petition is dismissed.

If reconsideration of this decision is desired, a petition for reconsideration under 37 CFR 1.378(e) must be filed within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. No extension of this 2-month time limit can be granted under 37 CFR 1.136(a) or

A grantable petition to accept a delayed maintenance fee payment under 37 CFR 1:378(b) must be include

⁽¹⁾ the required maintenance fee set forth in § 1.20(e) through (g);

⁽²⁾ the surcharge set forth in \$1.20(I)(1); and

⁽³⁾ a showing that the delay was unavoidable since reasonable care was taken to ensure that the maintenance fee would be paid timely and that the petition was filed promptly after the patentee was notified of, or otherwise became aware of, the expiration of the patent. The showing must enumerate the steps taken to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee, the date and the manner in which patentee became aware of the expiration of the patent, and the steps taken to file the petition promptly.

(b). Any such petition for reconsideration must be accompanied by the petition fee of \$400.00 as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(f). The petition for reconsideration should include an exhaustive attempt to provide the lacking item(s) noted below, since, after a decision on the petition for reconsideration, no further reconsideration or review of the matter will be undertaken by the Director.

The patent issued on March 19, 2002. The first maintenance fee was timely paid. The second maintenance fee could have been paid during the period from March 19 through September 21, 2009, or, with a surcharge, during the period from September 22, 2009 through March 19, 2010. The patent expired at midnight on March 19, 2010 for failure to timely pay the second maintenance fee.

Petitioner, pro se, asserts that the delay in payment of the maintenance fee was unavoidable due to financial difficulties.

The Director may accept late payment of the maintenance fee if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Director to have been "unavoidable". A patent owner's failure to pay a maintenance fee may be considered to have been "unavoidable" if the patent owner "exercised the due care of a reasonably prudent person." This determination is to be made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account."4 Unavoidable delay under 35 U.S.C. § 41(b) is measured by the same standard as that for reviving an abandoned application under 35 U.S.C. § 133. Under 35 U.S.C. § 133, the Director may revive an abandoned application if the delay in responding to the relevant outstanding Office requirement is shown to the satisfaction of the Director to have been "unavoidable". Decisions on reviving abandoned applications have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable. 6 However, a petition to revive an application as unavoidably abandoned cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing the cause of the unavoidable delay.'

² 35 U.S.C. § 41(c)(1).

Ray v. Lehman, 55 F.3d 606, 608-09 (Fed.Cir.), cert. denied, -- U.S. ---, 116 S.Ct. 304, L.Ed.2d 209 (1995).

⁴ <u>Smith v. Mossinghoff</u>, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982).

In re Patent No. 4,409,763, 7 USPQ2d 1798, 1800 (PTO Comm'r 1988).

Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (Comm'r Pat. 1887) (the term "unavoidable" "is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business"); In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (D.C. Cir. 1912); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (Comm'r Pat. 1913).

Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 5 USPQ2d 1130 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

view of <u>In re Patent No. 4,409,763</u>, 8 this same standard will be applied to determine whether "unavoidable" delay within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.378(b) occurred.

This petition does not satisfy the requirement of 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3). The statements presented in the petition fail to satisfy the showing required to establish unavoidable delay within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.378(b).

Petitioner has not presented a sufficient showing of unavoidable delay resulting from financial hardship. A showing of unavoidable delay based upon financial condition must establish that the financial condition of the responsible party during the entire period of the delay was such as to excuse the delay. A complete showing is required of petitioner's, or the party responsible for payment of the maintenance fee's, financial condition including all income, expense, assets, credit, and obligations which made the delay from March 19, 2010 until the filing of the petition on August 13, 2012 in payment of the maintenance fee, unavoidable. Petitioner must provide verified copies of any available documents or records covering the entire period between March 19, 2010, and August 13, 2012.

The showing must also enumerate the date and the manner in which patentee became aware of the expiration of the patent, and the steps taken to file the petition promptly. Statements from all persons who contributed to the delay are also required, and must be verified by including a declaration according to 37 CFR 1.68. Furthermore, petitioner should identify the party responsible for making the payment.

In summary, the showing of record is inadequate to establish unavoidable delay. As petitioner has not shown that it exercised the standard of care observed by a reasonable person in the conduct of his or her most important business, the petition will be dismissed. 10

Petitioner is cautioned to avoid submitting personal information in a patent application that may contribute to identity theft. If personal information such as social security numbers, bank account numbers, or credit card numbers are included in documents submitted to the USPTO (other than a check or credit card

^{8 7} USPQ2d 1798, 1800 (Comm'r Pat. 1988), aff'd sub nom. Rydeen v. Quigg, 748 937 F.2d 623 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (table), cert. denied, 502 U.S. 1075 (1992).

See note 6, supra. See Ex parte Murray, 1891 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 130, 131 (1891).

authorization form PTO-2038 submitted for payment purposes), petitioners should consider redacting such personal information from the documents before submitting them to the USPTO. This type of personal information is never required by the USPTO to support a petition or an application. Petitioner is advised that any information submitted in an application is available to the public after publication of the application (unless a non-publication request in compliance with 37 CFR 1.213(a) is made in the application) or issuance of a patent. Furthermore, information from an abandoned application may also be available to the public if the application is referenced in a published application or an issued patent (see 37 CFR 1.14). Checks and credit card authorization forms PTO-2038 submitted for payment purposes are not retained in the application file and therefore are not publicly available.

In summary, the showing of record has been considered, but does not rise to the level of unavoidable delay. Petitioner has not carried the burden of proof to establish to the satisfaction of the Director that the delay in payment of the second maintenance fee was unavoidable. Since petitioner has not shown unavoidable delay, the petition will be dismissed.

Petitioner should note that if this petition is not renewed, or if renewed and not granted, then the maintenance fee and post-expiration surcharge are refundable.

The \$400.00 petition fee for seeking reconsideration is not refundable. Any request for refund should be in writing to the address noted below.

The address in the petition is different than the correspondence address. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the address in the petition. All future correspondence, however, will be mailed solely to the address of record. A change of correspondence address (form enclosed) should be filed if the correspondence address needs to be updated.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:

Mail Stop Petition Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 By FAX:

(571) 273-8300

Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand:

Customer Service Window

Mail Stop Petition Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries should be directed to the undersigned at 571-272-3231.

Douglas I. Wood

Senior Petitions Attorney

Office of Petitions

Encl: PTO/SB/123

Cc: HOWARD R. JOHNSON

308 E. FRANKLIN AVE, BUILDING B

EL SEGUNDO CA 90245

PTO/SB/123 (11-08) Approved for use through 11/30/2011. OMB 0651-0035

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Patent Number **CHANGE OF** Issue Date **CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS** Application Number Patent Filing Date Address to: Mail Stop Post Issue First Named Inventor Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Attorney Docket Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Number Please change the Correspondence Address for the above-identified patent to: The address associated with Customer Number: OR Firm or **Individual Name** Address City State ZIP Country Telephone **Email** This form cannot be used to change the data associated with a Customer Number. To change the data associated with an existing Customer Number use "Request for Customer Number Data Change" (PTO/SB/124). This form will not affect any "fee address" provided for the above-identified patent. To change a "fee address" use the "Fee Address Indication Form" (PTO/SB/47). I am the: Patentee. Assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96). Attorney or agent of record. Registration Number Signature Typed or Printed Name Telephone

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.33. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 3 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop Post Issue, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms

if more than one signature is required, see below*.

forms are submitted.

*Total of

Privacy Act Statement

The Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579) requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

- The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
- 2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
- A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
- 4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
- 5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
- 6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
- 7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (i.e., GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
- 8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
- A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.